

-Meeting Summary-

March 16, 2011 - (1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.)

1. Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m., March 16, 2011, by the Chair of the Delta Independent Science Board (Delta ISB), Dr. Richard Norgaard. Seven members of the Delta Independent Science Board were present on the call for the meeting: Elizabeth Canuel, Tracy Collier, Brian Atwater, Judy Meyer, Jeffrey Mount, Richard Norgaard, and John Wiens. Vince Resh, Edward Houde, and Michael Healey were absent from the teleconference.

Delta Science Program Staff in attendance:

Marina Brand, Lauren Hastings, and Cliff Dahm.

Chair Norgaard welcomed participants. No new conflicts, or need for new disclosures had arisen for the Board. Atwater stated that he had contacted the USGS and they advised him to remove himself from a proposal that will be submitted by SFEI in response to DFG's proposal solicitation process. Wiens will also be asking that his name be removed from this same proposal.

2. Finalize and Approve Comments on 1st Draft of the Delta Plan for Submittal to the Delta Stewardship Council (action)

Norgaard briefly outlined the broad concerns of the Delta ISB and then initiated discussion of the draft comments that had been posted to the website on March 10, 2011. The comments were separated into three parts and discussion proceeded accordingly.

Part I

Canuel indicated that she liked the examples that had been selected to show trends but questioned the conclusion regarding whether or not the relationship had actually weakened over time when viewing Figure 5. The figure was adapted from a paper by Sommer et al 2007, and it was agreed that Ted Sommer would be contacted regarding the use and interpretation of the figure prior to finalizing the comments.

Part II

Norgaard indicated that overall, he would like to see a better connection between science and policy. There ensued a discussion of the wording in section B (page 7) – Cite comprehensive syntheses documents when available - with respect to the wording in section C (page 8) – Use primary sources whenever appropriate, including sources that are not in complete agreement with each other. Meyer felt that there was a discrepancy in the direction provided in each section

Delta Independent Science Board Meeting: Teleconference
March 16, 2011

and Atwater suggested that maybe they should not be so prescriptive. Norgaard indicated that he would reword both to eliminate any potential conflict between the two.

Next, there was discussion regarding how references in the Delta Plan should be used. Norgaard stated that individual policy prescriptions need to be tied to specific references. He went on to comment about when synthesis documents can be used and when it is appropriate to use the original papers. Norgaard was concerned that in their comments *The State of Bay Delta Science*, the PPIC reports and the POD synthesis report were cited but not any agency or other reports. Mount indicated that these “other” reports do not contain the syntheses that occur in the cited reports and that the references provided in the comments were not meant to be exhaustive, but only examples. Hastings suggested that a lead-in sentence indicating the references are meant as examples be provided. Dahm also mentioned the inclusion of relevant books as appropriate citations.

Meyer had several comments. She was very surprised that the Delta Plan never cited *The State of Bay Delta Science*. She was also concerned that the comments did not include a statement that organizing the Delta Plan by statute is awkward. Norgaard indicated that the statement was included but Meyer felt it was too subtle and needed to be strengthened. She was also concerned that the comments did not include any statements regarding best available science, but was okay with that as long as their next comment letter, which would include their review of the Adaptive Management chapter, would include it.

Atwater requested that a statement requiring that the Findings fact sheets be included as part of the Delta Plan is incorporated into the comments.

Part III

Norgaard made it clear that this portion of the comments represented a compendium of Delta ISB member’s individual comments. No effort had been made to standardize the format and he suggested that perhaps Science Program staff could make suggestions for future comments.

A discussion of Chapter 9 of the Delta Plan followed. Norgaard said there were few comments on this chapter because the chapter did not contain much information. Canuel wanted to know if the Delta ISB should suggest that the authors of the Delta Plan utilize the social science literature. Norgaard responded that the problem in the Delta is that the social scientists have not paid much attention to it so that might not be a helpful suggestion. He suggested that the authors of the Delta Plan should utilize census and other best available data rather than citing legislation.

Next, there was discussion regarding including additional citations in the comments. For example, Meyer felt that on page 16 a reference is needed for “Habitat complexity will favor

certain species...” Mount suggested one of the Sommer references. It was agreed that Grossinger should not be cited as the work has not yet been published.

It was concluded that organization and format of this portion of the comments (Part III) would remain in the final as proposed in the draft comments. However, this will be better organized in the next set of comments. In addition, Meyer stated that the next letter should be organized to reflect that the memo, in its entirety, is a Delta ISB consensus document and not an accumulation of individual comments.

Collier reiterated that some of the verbiage in the comments be phrased in a less subtle manner with respect to intent.

Hastings and Wiens discussed the numbers used on page 9 of the comments and how they line up with the page numbers in the Delta Plan. Wiens verified that the numbers referred to the lines on the page and that he would revise this part for clarification.

Norgaard asked for public comment on this agenda item. There was none.

Norgaard then summarized the changes that he would make for the final comments. The Delta ISB approved the comments with the stipulated changes, 7-0.

3. Lead Scientist Recruitment Update

Michelle Shouse from the USGS informed the Delta ISB that she had discovered that the current approach being used to recruit a new Lead Scientist was not entirely correct and that she needed to redo some steps. This primarily involved the use of questions that need to be included in the Job Announcement. She had been unaware that there is a “Question Library” from which the questions must be drawn and had been operating under the assumption that questions developed by Dahm and Hastings could be used directly. She is now in the process of finding those questions in the “library” that most closely correspond to the ones prepared by Dahm and Hastings.

Shouse stated that she plans to submit the proposed job announcement to Human Resources the week of March 21 and that Human Resources has indicated it can advertise the position a few days later.

Shouse also informed the Delta ISB that the job announcement cannot be released to them until there is an official release through the USGS. In lieu of that, Hastings suggested that the Delta ISB move forward with just the flyer that was prepared a while ago in order to facilitate recruitment. It was agreed that a letter, CV, and references be submitted to Shouse by any interested candidates that do not need to use the USGS process to be considered.

4. Public Comment (For matters that were not on the agenda, but within subject matter jurisdiction of the Delta ISB.)

There were no comments by any members of the public.

5. Preparation for next Delta ISB meeting

The next meeting of the Delta ISB is scheduled for April 7-8, 2011. One of the first items on the agenda will be discussions with individual chapter authors of the Delta Plan. This could occupy most of the morning of the first day.

Next, discussion focused on what should be reviewed in the second draft of the Delta Plan. It was agreed that the original plan, to only review those portions of the second draft that were not part of the first draft, be adhered to. Hastings noted that the intent is to release the second draft of the Delta Plan on Friday, March 18. New chapters will include Adaptive Management, Governance, Finance, and Water Quality as well as a reworked Chapter 1 and draft Policies and Recommendations.

Dahm noted that a lot of work needs to be done to link proposed Policies to the Findings.

Hastings said that the Findings for water quality will be new and Collier requested that Delta ISB members send any comments they have on the Water Quality Findings to him.

Norgaard reiterated that since there is so much to do, that the Delta ISB should focus their next review on Adaptive Management and Water Quality and leave Finance and the Policies and Recommendations for their review of the third draft of the Delta Plan. He also said that he would like to continue the discussion of the quality of the science but not as a separate agenda item, rather in the context of reviewing the Adaptive Management chapter.

Meyer agreed with the focus of their next review and asked the Delta ISB to think about the stability of money as well as the quantity of available money. In addition, she remains concerned that the Delta ISB may be embedding themselves too much in the process of developing the Delta Plan. She wants to be sure they preserve their status as a review body.

In summary, April 7 will be devoted to discussion and April 8 will be used to prepare comments.

Brand and Hastings agreed to send/resend all of the meeting dates the Delta ISB agreed to at their last meeting as well as hotel information for the Sacramento area.

6. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:00 p.m.